

8

Notes on the *Electra* of Euripides¹

JAMES DIGGLE

409 ('Ηλ.) ἔλθ' ὡς παλαιὸν τροφὸν ἐμὸν φίλου πατρός.

"Go to my aged tutor of a dear father." This lopsided sentence admits of two easy corrections, between which editors have found that the choice is not easy. In Victorius' τροφὸν ἐμοῦ φίλου πατρός either ἐμοῦ or φίλου is otiose. *HF* 1281–1282 οὐτ' ἐμαῖς φίλαις/ Θήβαις ἐνοικεῖν ὅσιον lends no support, for in Heracles' complaint that "it is not lawful for me to live in my beloved Thebes" each epithet adds its separate stab of pain; nor is any more support afforded by the words imputed to the dying Agamemnon at 1151–1152 below, φονεύσεις φίλαν/ πατρίδα . . . ἐλθόντ' ἐμάν;. In Camper's τροφὸν ἐμοῦ φίλον πατρός the word-order (noun A, adj. B, adj. A, noun B) is not unexampled: 489 πρόσβασιν τῶνδ' (τήνδ' Musgrave, perhaps rightly) ὀρθίαν οἴκων, *Hec.* 44 ἀδελφὴν τῶιδ' ἐμὴν ἐν ἡματι (*v.l.* τὴν ἐμὴν τῇιδ' ἡμέραι), *Tr.* 498–499 γάμον μιᾶς ἑνα/ γυναικός, *Hel.* 571 γυναικῶν . . . εἰς δυοῖν . . . πόσις, *S. Ai.* 859 γῆς ἱερὸν οἰκείας πέδον, *El.* 730 ναυαγίων Κριταῖον ἱππικῶν πέδον, *OT* 52 ὄρνιθι . . . τὴν τότε αἰείωι τύχην, 109 ἔχρος παλαιᾶς δυστέκμαρτον αἰτίας, *Tr.* 613 θυτῆρα καινῶι καινὸν ἐν πεπλώματι, and from lyrics *Tr.* 151–152 πλαγαῖς Φρυγίους (Wilamowitz, -ίαις codd.) εὐκόμποις . . . θεοῖς, *IT* 408 ῥοθίοις εἰλατίνας δικρότοισι κώπας (Reiske, ῥ- ἐλατίνοις δ- κώπαις L), *S. Ai.* 357 γένος ναίας ἄρωγόν τέχνας, *Tr.* 994–995 ἱερῶν οἶαν οἶων . . . χάριν. But while it would be going too far to say that in these passages the word-order was positively stylish, it would be fair to say that, in comparison with these, the style of τροφὸν ἐμοῦ φίλον πατρός, where "the interlaced hyperbaton . . . throws a great deal of weight on two not very weighty adjectives" (Denniston), is positively graceless. The style of the phrase is not enhanced by the prior attachment to τροφὸν of the adjective παλαιόν.

There is a further complication: the Old Man was Agamemnon's τροφεύς, not his τροφός. When Amphytrion at *HF* 45 describes himself as

τροφὸν τέκνων οἰκουρόν, it is unnecessary for Elmsley² to re-name him τροφέα, because, as Wilamowitz says, “hier zeigt die Verbindung mit οἰκουρόν, dass der Ausdruck mit Absicht gewählt ist, weil Amph. nicht mehr ἐν ἀνδράσιν ist, denn auch das οἰκουρεῖν ist spezifisch Weibersache.” But in our passage Elmsley’s τροφέα is indispensable; and it opens the way for a further change which removes all difficulties: ἐλθ’ ὡς παλαιὸν τροφέα μοι φίλου πατρός, “do me the favour of going. . . .” The role of the dative may be illustrated by *Su.* 36–37 οἷχεται δέ μοι/ κῆρυξ πρὸς ἄστν and *S. OC* 1475–1476 ὡς τάχιτά μοι μολών/ ἄνακτα χώρας τῇδε τις πορευεάτω: see also Kühner–Gerth i.423. A parallel, if one is needed, for the dative’s position between noun and dependent genitive is provided by *A. Ch.* 193–194 εἶναι τόδ’ ἀγλαίεμά μοι τοῦ φιλάτου/ βροτῶν Ὀρέετον.

432–436

Χο. κλειναὶ νᾶες, αἶ ποτ’ ἔβατε Τροίαν
τοῖς ἀμετρήτοις ἐρετμοῖς
πέμπουσαι χοροὺς μετὰ Νηρήιδων,
435 Ἴν’ ὁ φίλανλος ἔπαλλε δελ-
φίς . . .

“Famous ships, which went to Troy with oars beyond number, *escorting the dances with the Nereids*, where the flute-loving dolphin gambolled. . . .” If the words which I have translated “escorting the dances with the Nereids” could mean, as Paley would have it, “escorting the Nereids in their dances,” then all would be well. But they cannot. He translates πέμπουσαι χοροὺς Νηρήιδων and ignores μετὰ. This preposition indicates that someone is dancing with the Nereids. “Probably Euripides thought of ship, Nereids, and dolphins as all dancing in concert,” says Denniston, citing *Hel.* 1451–1455 Φοίνισσα Σιδωνιάς ὦ ταχεῖα κώπα . . . χοραγὲ τῶν καλλιχόρων δελφίνων and *S. OC* 716–719 ἃ δ’ εὐήρετμος . . . πλάτα θρώσκει, τῶν ἐκατομπόδων Νηρήιδων ἀκόλουθος. Weil is more expansive: “Avec leurs rames innombrables, qui sont comme autant de pieds, les vaisseaux dansent sur les flots, et les flots, agités par le mouvement des rames, bondissent autour des vaisseaux, semblent s’associer à leur danse. Traduisez ces faites en langage poétique et mythologique, vous verrez les chœurs des Néréides accompagner la danse des vaisseaux.”

¹ I am indebted to Sir Denys Page for invaluable criticism. The following editions are referred to: P. Victorius (Rome, 1545), A. Seidler (Leipzig, 1813), F. H. Bothe (Leipzig, 1826), P. Camper (Leiden, 1831), C. A. Walberg (Leipzig, 1869), F. A. Paley (London, 1874²), C. H. Keene (London, 1893), N. Wecklein (Leipzig, 1898), H. Weil (Paris, 1903³), N. Wecklein (Leipzig, 1906), G. Murray (Oxford, 1913³), L. Parmentier (ed. Budé, Paris, 1925), J. D. Denniston (Oxford, 1939).

² *Qu. Rev.* 14 (1812), 447. He compares the corruption of τροφεύς to τροφός in some manuscripts at *S. Ph.* 344.

But even if we could countenance those dancing vessels of Weil, using their innumerable oars for feet, like a convoy of waltzing centipedes, how are we to reconcile the expression *πέμπουσαι χορούς* with the preposition *μετά*? It is no help to compare, as Keene and Denniston do, the phrase *πομπὴν πέμπειν*. Because this means "take part in a procession," it does not follow that *πέμπειν χορούς* means "take part in a dance." The words *πέμπουσαι χορούς* ought to mean not that the ships participate in the dance but that they accompany or escort the dancers on their way: like the pair of eagles which *Ἀχαιῶν δίθρονον κράτος . . . πέμπει ξὺν δορὶ καὶ χειρὶ πράκτορι . . . Τευκρίδ' ἐπ' αἶαν* (A. *Ag.* 109–113), or like the sons of Hephaestus who escorted Apollo to Delphi (*πέμπουσι* A. *Eum.* 12), or like Nessus who ferried Deianeira across the Evenus (S. *Tr.* 570–571 *ὀνήσει τῶν ἐμῶν . . . πορθμῶν, ὁθούνεχ' ὑστάτην ἑ' ἔπεμψ' ἐγώ*).

In short we do not want the preposition *μετά*. Without it we have an expression (*χορούς* *Νηρηίδων*) which is found at *Andr.* 1267 (sing. *χορός*), *Tr.* 2, *IT* 274 (*χορός*), 428. And so perhaps Euripides wrote not *χορούς* *μετά* but *χορεύματα*, a noun of which he is fond: 875, *HF* 891, *Ion* 1474, *Ph.* 655, *Ba.* 132, *Erechtheus* fr. 65.80 Austin; also A. P.Oxy 2245.I.iii.3, Pratinas, *PMG* 708.1 (= Snell, *TGF* i, p. 82), *Ar. Av.* 746.

479–486

τοῖωνδ' ἄνακτα δοριπόνων
 480/1 ἔκανεν ἀνδρῶν, Τυνδαρί,
 481/2 καὶ λέχεα, κακόφρον κόρα.
 τοιγάρ σέ ποτ' οὐρανίδαί
 πέμψουσι †θανάτοις· κᾶν†
 485 ἔτ' ἔτι φόνιον ὑπὸ δέρας
 ὄψομαι αἶμα χυθὲν ἐνιδάρωι.

481 Τυνδαρί, καὶ λέχεα Seidler, *τυνδαρίς ἀλέχεα* L 482 κακόφρον Radermacher, -φρων L κόρα Dindorf, κούρα L 485 ἔτ' ἔτι Seidler, ἔτι ἔτι L δέρας Wecklein, -αν L 486 ὄψομαι Erfurd, ὄψομ' L

For the moment let us accept *πέμψουσι* <ν> *θανάτοις(ι)*, which all editors print, and ignore *κᾶν*, which they emend in different ways. "Such were the spearmen whose leader was killed by your adulterous bed, daughter of Tyndareus, malignant woman.³ Therefore the gods will send you to

³ I have preferred Seidler's *Τυνδαρί*, with *brevis in longo*, to Murray's *Τυνδαρίς*. Nominative is occasionally used for vocative in tragedy (for a recent discussion see V. Schmidt, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Herondas* [Berlin, 1968], pp. 89–95), but seldom is *ᾶ* absent. When it is absent, in passages like *Med.* 1133 *μὴ σπέρχων, φίλος*, and *Ph.* 629 *κᾶν τί σοι, πόλις, γένηται*, a preceding second-person form precludes the confusion which is present in *El.* 480, where a third-person verb *ἔκανε* precedes. On the infringement of Porson's law in this line see L. P. E. Parker, *CQ* n.s. 16 (1966), 16.

your death. Soon I shall see beneath your neck the bloody gore shed by steel."

"The gods will send you to your death": Clytemnestra may be sent to her death in English, but may she in Greek? And why the plural *θανάτοις*(ι)? Is it any more possible in Greek than in English to send a person to his deaths?

"For the dative," says Denniston, "cf. *IT* 159 *Ἄϊδαι πέμψας*, and Hom. *Il.* 1.3 *"Αἶδι προΐαψεν."* But Hades is a place, death is not. Camper compares Pi. *Ol.* 2.82 *Κύκνον τε θανάτῳ πόρεν*. But *πόρεν* is not *ἔπεμψεν*: Pindar has reversed the normal construction of this verb (*Pyth.* 4.297 *μήτ' ὦν τινι πῆμα πορών*) by analogy with the alternative construction of *δίδωμι* (*Pyth.* 5.60–61 *ἔδωκ' Ἀπόλλων θήρας αἰνῶι φόβῳ*).

Now consider the plural. "Pluralem *θάνατοι* saepius noster usurpat, ubi de violenta, sive, quod fere eodem redit, de praematura morte, sermo est," says Seidler; and Wecklein agrees—"Plural von gewaltsamen Tode." Maybe; but what we need to know is whether the plural is used of the death, violent or not, of a single person. "Some of the cases," says Denniston, "where *θάνατοι* appears to be used of the death of an individual are illusory . . . But cf. A. *Ch.* 53, S. *El.* 206 (Jebb), *Tr.* 1276, *OT* 497." I transcribe the passages: A. *Ch.* 51–53 *ἀνῆλθοι βροτοστρυγεῖς/ δνόφοι καλύπτουσι δόμους/ δεσποτῶν θανάτοις*, S. *El.* 206 *θανάτους αἰκεῖς διδύμαιν χειροῖν*, *Tr.* 1276–1277 *μεγάλους μὲν ἰδοῦσα νέους θανάτους,/ πολλὰ δὲ πῆματα <καὶ> καινοπαγῇ*, *OT* 496–497 *Λαβδακίδαις/ ἐπικούρος ἀδῆλων θανάτων*. These passages have two features in common. First, the word for death is not the only plural in the sentence. In two of the passages the victim is also named in the plural. In the other two passages plurals of a different kind are linked to *θάνατοι*: in *El.* 206 *θανάτους αἰκεῖς διδύμαιν χειροῖν* means "attempts on his life by two pairs of hands"; in *Tr.* 1276, even if the "great new deaths" refer only to the death of Deianeira and not also (which I think more probable) to the imminent death of Heracles, the allusive generalizing plural matches the following generalized reference to *πολλὰ πῆματα*.

Second, these deaths are the deaths of persons much lamented. The plural is apt, for the reason given by "Longinus" 23.3: *χυθεῖς εἰς τὰ πληθυντικὰ ὁ ἀριθμὸς συνεπλήθυνε καὶ τὰς ἀτυχίας*, as he remarks after quoting S. *OT* 1403 ff. *ὦ γάμοι γάμοι,/ ἐφύσαθ' ἡμᾶς καὶ φυτεύσαντες πάλιν/ ἀνείτε ταυτὸν σπέρμα κάπεδείξατε/ πατέρας ἀδελφούς παῖδας κτλ.* He adds a caution: *οὐ μέντοι δεῖ ποιεῖν αὐτὸ ἐπ' ἄλλων, εἰ μὴ ἐφ' ὧν δέχεται τὰ ὑποκείμενα αὐξῆσιν ἢ πληθὺν ἢ ὑπερβολὴν ἢ πάθος, ἐν τι τούτων ἢ πλείονα, ἐπεὶ τοι τὸ πανταχοῦ κώδωνας ἐξήφθαι λίαν σοφιστικόν.* I see no justification for

referring to the death of Clytemnestra, who will be lamented by nobody, in the honorific plural.⁴

But even if the words *τοιγάρ ἐέ ποτ' οὐρανίδαι πέμψουσι* <ν> *θανάτοις*(ι) were acceptable, there would still remain the difficulty of what to do with *κᾶν*. And what editors do with *κᾶν* is far from satisfying.⁵ Murray, following Weil and Keene, prints K. Schenkl's *θανάτοις· ἡ δὲ κᾶν*.⁶ The chief merit of this conjecture is its palaeographical simplicity (HC ~ IK), since *ἡ* ("Affirmative, mostly with adjectives and adverbs," Denniston, *Greek Particles*, p. 280) is not especially appropriate here, and the sentence would begin much better with *ἔτ' ἔτι*.⁷ No more attractive are Nauck's *θανάτοις· ἡ μὲν* or L. Dindorf's *θανάτοις· κᾶν δ'*. Parmentier's defence of *κᾶν* I pass over in silence.

Murray proposed *κοί ποτ' . . . θανάτοις <ἵσαν δ>ίκαν*, which he appears to have interpreted as "the gods will send you an equivalent punishment for (his) death."⁸ The dative *θανάτοις*, now referring to Agamemnon, is unsatisfactory. Grammatically it is sound enough: compare 148-149 *χέρα τε κῤῥᾶτ' ἐπὶ κούριμον/ τιθεμένα θανάτῳ κᾶν* ("beating my shaven head for your death"), *Med.* 1286-1287 *πίτνει δ' ἅ τάλαν' ἐς ἄλμαν φόνῳ/ τέκνων δυσσεβεῖ*, *A. Ch.* 53 (quoted above). Nor would it be right to object to the superfluity of such an explanatory dative after the explanatory *τοιγάρ* ("therefore [because of his death] the gods will send you punishment for his death"), for this is an idiomatic superfluity: *Su.* 191-192 *οὐδ' χρεῖα πόλεις/ πολλὰ διώλυντ' ἐνδεεῖς στρατηλάτου*, Wilamowitz on *HF* 842. What disqualifies *θανάτοις* is its plural number. The plural, unaided by any other plural noun in the context, fails one of the tests which I have prescribed for the plural of this noun.

Nevertheless, Murray's approach is a profitable one. The words *κοί . . . πέμψουσι . . . δίκαν* would give good sense, if the troublesome plural *θανάτοις*(ι) could be disposed of. I suggest that we accept Murray's *κοί*, elicit *δίκαν* from the letters *-κι καν*, and alter *θανάτοις* to *θανάτου*:

*τοιγάρ κοί ποτ' οὐρανίδαι
πέμψουσιν θανάτου δίκαν.*

⁴ Denniston quotes three further passages where other plurals are used to denote death: 137 *αἱμάτων* ('bloodshed', a regular use of this plural), *S. Ant.* 1313 *μόρων* (irrelevant, since two deaths are referred to), and more pertinently *S. El.* 779 *φόνους πατρώιους* (the murder of Agamemnon). For the "honorific" plural, in general, see Kühner-Gerth i.18.

⁵ Metre offers no guidance, since the passage is not in responsion. For analysis of the metre see Denniston, p. 220.

⁶ *ZδG* 25 (1874), 90-91.

⁷ If Wecklein's *δέρας* (1906 ed.) is accepted, as it almost certainly should be, we shall have to read *ἡ δὲ κᾶν* (see Denniston, who also suggests *θανάτοις· κᾶν*).

⁸ This is the interpretation implied by his verse-translation: "Therefore the tribes of Heaven one day/ for these thy dead shall send on thee/ an iron death."

"Therefore the gods will send you punishment for his death." The expression *θανάτου δίκαν* may be compared with 977 *φόνου . . . δίκας*, *IT* 339 *δίκας . . . σφαγῆς*, *Or.* 500 *αἵματος δίκην*. The metre is choriambic dimeter and glyconic. For the verb *πέμπειν* used of the dealings of gods with men compare *Antiope* 97 Page *θεοῦ πέμψαντος οἶα βούλεται*, fr. 916.6–7 *Διόθεν/ θανάτου πεμφθεῖσα τελευτή*. For *δίκην* as the object compare *S. Ph.* 1265–1266 *μῶν τί μοι μέγα/ πάρεστε πρὸς κακοῖσι πέμποντες κακόν;*. Even closer, if the text is sound, will be *A. Eum.* 203 *ἔχρησα ποινὰς τοῦ πατρὸς πέμψαι* ("impose punishment for his father's murder"): see R. D. Dawe, *The collation and investigation of manuscripts of Aeschylus* (Cambridge, 1964), p. 100. Also comparable is 1169 *νέμει τοι δίκαν θεός*.

503–506

Ἥλ. τί δ', ὦ γεραῖέ, διάβροχον τόδ' ὅμμ' ἔχεις;
 μῶν τὰμὰ διὰ χρόνον ε' ἀνέμνησαν κακά;
 505 ἦ τὰς Ὀρέστου τλήμονας φυγὰς στένεις
 καὶ πατέρα τὸν ἐμόν . . .;

These are Electra's first words to the Old Man. "Why are you weeping? Have they reminded you of my troubles after so long a time?" The plural *ἀνέμνησαν* is indefensible, since no plural subject is available. "The subject can only be οἱ ξένοι, supplied from 500," writes Denniston. ". . . But 500 is somewhat far away, and it is not very natural to say that the strangers have 'reminded' the Old Man of anything." No, it is not at all natural.

Denniston, together with Paley, Keene, Wecklein, and Parmentier, accepts Dobree's *ἀνέμνησεν*. "Can it be that my present misfortunes have reminded you after so long a time?" is Paley's translation. Reminded of what? Of "domus nostrae mala," Dobree; "of past events, the murder of Agamemnon, etc.," Paley; "δακρύων, suggested by *διάβροχον* in the preceding line," Keene; "le souvenir des tiens [maux]," Parmentier. It appears that we are free to supplement the sense in whatever way we wish, since the sense refuses to disclose what supplement is wanted. Denniston has a different approach. "The verb is used absolutely, 'stirred your recollection.'" But there is no satisfactory parallel for such a use, as Denniston himself admits. Weil alone has rejected these subterfuges. His conjectures, an unhappy pair, are ε' ἐκίνησ' αὖ κακά and ε' ἀνεκίνησε διὰ χρόνον κακά.

Sense and Euripidean usage are restored by accepting *ἀνέμνησεν* and changing *κακά* to the genitive: *μῶν τὰμὰ διὰ χρόνον ε' ἀνέμνησεν κακῶν;*, "has the sight of my condition after so long reminded you of your troubles?" For the construction see *Alc.* 1045 *μή μ' ἀναμνήσῃς* (LP, *μή με μμνήσῃς* vel *μμνήσκεις* cett.) *κακῶν*, *Ion* 284 *ὥς μ' ἀνέμνησάς τινος*. Also comparable, both for *κακῶν* and for the sentiment, is *Or.* 1032 *ἐς*

δάκρυα πορθμείους' ὑπομνήσει (Musgrave, -μνησιν codd.) κακῶν ("bringing me to tears by reminding me of our troubles"). No qualification is needed by κακῶν in any of these passages, since the context makes its reference clear. The Old Man, cast out of the city by Aegisthus, has his own share of the troubles of Agamemnon's household, and Electra asks whether it is these that the sight of her has awakened, or whether he weeps rather for the exiled Orestes and the murdered Agamemnon.

567-568

Πρ. βλέψον νυν ἐς τόνδ', ὦ τέκνον, τὸν φίλτατον.
'Ἦλ. πάλαι δέδορκα, μὴ κύ γ' οὐκέτ' εὖ φρονῆμι.

Everyone used to accept Victorius' δέδοικα, which removes the solecism of δέδορκα μὴ φρονῆμι—a solecism because, as Jackson says simply, "δέδορκα is no synonym of σκοπῶ."⁹ But recently four attempts have been made to reinstate δέδορκα. I do not think that any of these attempts succeeds, although I believe that δέδορκα is indeed correct. The fault in δέδοικα is twofold. First, "the child's reply . . . is . . . an impertinence," Jackson. Second, "in stichomythia we pass from point to point, and here the command βλέψον cannot be overlooked: I *have* been looking for some time," H. D. Broadhead.¹⁰

Denniston saw in δέδορκα a play on words: "'I have long been looking—to see whether you have gone mad.' Electra means the Old Man to take δέδορκα in the physical sense at first, answering his βλέψον, until she rounds on him with μὴ κύ γ' οὐκέτ' εὖ φρονῆμι." The equivocation is frigid and hardly removes the solecism.

Jackson changed φρονῆμι to φρονεῖς and punctuated πάλαι δέδορκα.—μὴ κύ γ' οὐκέτ' εὖ φρονεῖς. "As the old man makes a motion to lead her to her brother, she ejaculates, like a well-brought-up young woman, 'Don't! Have you gone out of your senses?'" But, as Broadhead says, "the assumption of the by-play is quite gratuitous and unsupported by anything in the context. What makes Electra think the old man may be 'out of his senses' is clearly his reference to the stranger as τὸν φίλτατον."

The former objection was also made by P. T. Stevens,¹¹ who proposed to print a colon after δέδορκα and to take μὴ . . . φρονῆμι as an independent clause. This is unappealing, for a reason which he himself gives: "There is perhaps no exact parallel in Euripides to this use of μὴ with the present subjunctive to indicate that something may prove to be true, i.e., to make a cautious statement about the present."

⁹ CQ 35 (1941), 182 = *Marginalia scaenica* (Oxford, 1955), p. 173.

¹⁰ *Tragica* (Christchurch, 1968), p. 127.

¹¹ CR 60 (1946), 101-102.

Broadhead accepted Jackson's *φρονεῖς* and proposed the further change of AMH to ΑΛΛΗ: *πάλαι δέδορκ'· ἀλλ' ἡ κύ γ' οὐκέτ' εὖ φρονεῖς*;. He compared S. *El.* 879 *ἀλλ' ἡ μέμνηας*;. The sense is satisfactory,¹² but the further change was needless, since the adversative conjunction is not, as he insists, "indispensable." The same sense is given by *πάλαι δέδορκα· μὴ κύ γ' οὐκέτ' εὖ φρονεῖς*;, "I have been looking for a long time. Have you gone mad?" For *μὴ* introducing a question see *Hi.* 799, *Tr.* 178, *IA* 1536, *A. Pe.* 344, *Su.* 295, *Ag.* 683, *PV* 247, 959, *S. Tr.* 316, *OC* 1502.¹³ Such a question does not demand a negative answer: see Fraenkel on *Ag.* 683.

Now L has been collated many times, but it can still yield novelties in unexpected places. And here is a place where it has been reported wrongly. It is clear to me, from Spranger's facsimile, that L originally had *φρονεῖς*, which has been corrected (very neatly) to *φρονῆς*. The form of *ει* is clearly visible. But the decisive evidence is the circumflex accent. The circumflex is a continuation of the right vertical of *η* (*ει*), and it rises in a loop to the right of that vertical. This is the almost invariable way in which the scribe of L adds the circumflex to *ει*. He never represents the circumflex on *η* in this way. P has *φρονῆς*, so that the alteration was made either by the original scribe of L or by Triclinius during his first stage of correction.

According to A. Olivieri, *RFIC* 24 (1896), 471, *φρονεῖς* was also written by the scribe of Riccardianus 77. This manuscript is a very careless copy of L, made at the end of the fifteenth century: see A. Turyn, *The Byzantine manuscript tradition of the tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana, 1957), pp. 366–367.

893–896 (Op.) ἤκω γὰρ οὐ λόγοισιν ἀλλ' ἔργοις κτανὼν
 Αἰγισθον· ὥς δὲ τῷι κάφ' εἰδέναι τάδε
 895 προσθῶμεν, αὐτὸν τὸν θανόντα σοι φέρω,
 ὃν εἴτε χρήσεις θηρεῖν ἀρπαγὴν πρόθεσ . . .

"I come as Aegisthus' murderer not in word but in deed." What follows I give in Paley's paraphrase: "but, that I may add this ocular proof (*τάδε τεκμήρια*) to the certain knowledge you already have from my words, I bring you this head of Aegisthus." Denniston accepts this interpretation, though he toys with Heath's *τόδε* for *τάδε*. But the sense is preposterous. What poet, when he could make Orestes say "I have killed Aegisthus—here is his head to prove it," would allow him to say, in effect, "I assure you that I have killed Aegisthus—I know that you

¹² But the stop after the second foot is very uncommon in Euripides: see Denniston, *CQ* 30 (1936), 77–78.

¹³ Murray creates another instance at *Ion* 1523; wrongly, as the commentators will explain.

are quite certain that I have killed him, but here is his head too"? As Bothe puts it, "incerta confirmanda sunt, non certa" (in allusion to Heath's translation "ut vero ad certam huius rei scientiam confirmandam aliquid addamus"). Denniston's "But one can 'make assurance double sure,'" is hardly to the point.

From the time of Barnes to the time of Paley and even beyond, the ineptitude of the transmitted text was recognized, and in its place was printed Barnes's conjecture *ὥς δέ τῳ . . . προθῶμεν*, translated by Barnes as "ut autem cuivis clare haec proponamus, i.e., ut haec certo scias." The fatal objection to this was made by Paley: "Euripides would hardly have said, 'that *one* may know it, I bring *you* the dead body.'" A second objection of his must be discounted: "*πρόθεε* is rather awkwardly repeated in a somewhat different sense in the very next verse." The repetition is no more objectionable than such instances as 44-45 *ἡιχυνεν* ("dishonour") . . . *αἰσχύνομαι* ("am ashamed"), *S. Ph.* 1300-1301 *μὴ . . . μεθῆις βέλος./ —μέθεε με . . . χεῖρα*.¹⁴

I suggest that we read as follows:

ἦκω γὰρ οὐ λόγοις ἀλλ' ἔργοις κτανῶν
Αἴγιον· [ὥς δέ τῳ κάψ' εἰδέναι τάδε
προσθῶμεν] αὐτὸν τὸν θανόντα σοι φέρω . . .

The asyndeton is vigorous and was itself the cause of interpolation. Furthermore, the phrase *οὐ λόγοις ἀλλ' ἔργοις* finds a new resonance. According to Denniston, "it comes to nothing more than 'in very truth.'" And, indeed, with the transmitted text, that is all it can come to. In the less charitable opinion of Herwerden,¹⁵ the expression "non inutile tantum sed ridiculum est verborum pondus." That goes too far, as *Ion* 1298 *ὀπλοῖεν αὐτὴν οὐ λόγοις ἐρρύατο* (cited by Denniston) shows. But see how well the words are adapted to their new sequel: "I come not in word but in deed as the murderer of Aegisthus—I bring you his body." His word he has already given; his deed is confirmed by the bringing of the corpse.

For the interpolation not of a single complete line but of parts of two consecutive lines see *Alc.* 795b-796a (del. Herwerden), *Hel.* 9b-10a (del. Nauck), 388b-389a (del. Nauck), and possibly *Su.* 842b-843a (del. Hermann; see M. D. Reeve, *GRBS* 14 [1973], 149).

¹⁴ See also the references in my note on *Phaethon* 56 (Cambridge, 1970), to which may be added Page, *Actors' interpolations in Greek tragedy* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 123-124, and Verdenius, *Mnemosyne*, ser. iv 11 (1958), 203. Anyone who is intent on accepting Barnes's conjecture and avoiding the repetition may write *πρόεε* (Herwerden, *RPh* 2 [1878], 29). But *πρόθεε* is supported by *H. Il.* 24.409 and *S. El.* 1487.

¹⁵ *Mnemosyne* 28 (1899), 232.

962

Ὅρ. ἐπίσχεσ' ἐμβάλλωμεν εἰς ἄλλον λόγον.

Denniston writes: "Intransitive ἐμβάλλειν has several well-defined physical senses: among others, 'invade,' of an army (metaphorical at Pl. *Tht.* 165D), 'flow into a sea or lake,' of a river (e.g., Pl. *Phd.* 113C), 'lay on with oars.' None of these are suitable here." He proposes ἐκβάλλωμεν: "ἐκβάλλω is used at Pl. *Phd.* 113A of a river branching off, and Thucydides (1.97.2) uses ἐκβολή λόγον for 'digression.'" The parallels are insufficiently exact. And the tragedians do not use ἐκβάλλειν intransitively—for at 96 Denniston himself rightly accepts Dobree's ἐκβάλω πόδα for ἐκβάλω (ἐμ-Λγρ) ποδί. Indeed, he has forgotten what he wrote on 96: "The intransitive use of ἐκβάλλειν cannot be justified by ἐκβάλλειν of rivers, intransitive εἰσβάλλειν, βάλλ' ἐς κόρακας, and Verrall's defence of βαλῶ at A. *Ag.* 1172."¹⁶

The compound of βάλλω which Euripides does use intransitively (in the sense "enter"), and whose noun is used in precisely the connection exhibited by 962, is ἐσβάλλω. For the verb see *Hi.* 1198 χώρον εἰσβάλλομεν, *Cycl.* 99, *Andr.* 968, *Ba.* 1045, *Phaethon* 168 (= fr. 779.1),¹⁷ for the noun ("entering upon a thing, beginning," LSJ) see *Su.* 92 καινὰς ἐσβολὰς . . . λόγων, *Ion* 677 στεναγμαμάτων (Musgrave, στεναγμῶν L) τ' ἐσβολάς, *Ar. Ran.* 1104 ἐσβολαὶ . . . σοφισμάτων.

1013-1017 (Κλ.) λέξω δέ· καίτοι δόξ' ὅταν λάβῃ κακὴ
 1015 γυναῖκα, γλώσσει πικρότης ἐνεστί τις
 ὡς μὲν παρ' ἡμῖν, οὐ καλῶς τὸ πρᾶγμα δέ
 μαθόντας, ἦν μὲν ἀξίως μισεῖν ἔχῃ,
 στυγεῖν δίκαιον· εἰ δέ μή, τί δεῖ στυγεῖν;

1016 μαθόντας Reiske, -όντα c' L ἔχῃ Seidler, ἔχῃς L

"Hunc locum nemo intellexit," said Seidler. "Alii aliter vertunt, sed inepte omnes." His complaint still holds good. First, here is the conventional translation.¹⁸ "I shall explain.—And yet, when a woman gets a bad reputation, there is a certain bitterness in her tongue. *In my opinion, not fairly.* But when people have learned the facts, if these facts justify hatred, then it is right to hate; if not, why hate?"

¹⁶ See Fraenkel on this passage for a demolition of the alleged instances of the intransitive use of βάλλω and some of its compounds.

¹⁷ In these passages a simple accusative is used after the verb; but εἰς is commonly added by other writers when the verb is used intransitively (see LSJ s.v. II, who actually cite ἐσβάλλειν ἐς λόγον from Olympiodorus), and it is added by Euripides when he uses the verb transitively at 79 βοῦς εἰς ἀρούρας ἐσβαλὼν.

¹⁸ The reasons for accepting Reiske's and Seidler's emendations in 1016, and a defence of the anomalous prosody γυναῖκα γλώσσει, are given by Denniston.

The words *ὥς μὲν παρ' ἡμῖν, οὐ καλῶς*, "in my opinion, not fairly," do not fit their surroundings. Clytemnestra is excusing the sharpness of her tongue. She says that women whose reputations have been wronged may be expected to adopt a bitter tone. She is just such a woman. But if she says that such women are acting *οὐ καλῶς*, she is condemned out of her own mouth. Denniston remarks that "the sequence of thought, though not expressed with formal exactitude, is perfectly intelligible." His paraphrase runs: "I will tell you what I think of Agamemnon. But a maligned woman has a sharp edge to her tongue. In my opinion such bitterness is to be deplored. But she should not be condemned out of hand on account of it: she should be judged on the facts alone." This paraphrase misses the direction in which the reader is pointed by the *μὲν* and *δὲ* of 1015. These particles suggest that two opinions or attitudes are to be balanced. "My opinion is that such bitterness is to be deplored. Others, when they have learned the facts, but not before then, are entitled to their own opinion." This, so far, is unexceptionable. But we do not now expect "and they may find that their hatred is justified," which is to imply "and they may come to the same opinion as me." The structure of the sentence demands "and, after learning the facts, they are entitled to come to a different opinion—but not before then." Furthermore, this is a most unexpected concession which Denniston imputes to Clytemnestra. It is as if she were saying "I am going to speak sharply. It is wrong to do so. Please ignore my asperity and judge the facts alone." This is no way to ingratiate yourself or win over your opponent.¹⁹

Denniston betrayed his own uneasiness over this interpretation when he considered an alternative rendering, first proposed by Seidler,²⁰ of the words *γλώσσει πικρότης ἔνεστί τις*: "orationi eius invisi quid inest (i.e., eius orationem inviti audiunt, neque aequa lance pendunt) . . . πικρότης igitur est idem quod πικρόν τι, invisi, molesti quid." As Denniston puts it, "Dislike, *invidia*, attaches to her words, which are *πικροί*, 'repellent,' to the hearer." "This," he says with truth, "gives a smoother connection." With equal truth he adds "But *ἔνεστι* strongly suggests that *πικρότης* is a quality residing in the tongue." This is not so much strongly suggested as certain.²¹

¹⁹ Weil comes to the same conclusion: "Clytemnestre ne doit pas faire une telle restriction." He condemns *ὥς μὲν παρ' ἡμῖν* as corrupt.

²⁰ And adopted by Paley, Wilamowitz (*Hermes* 18 [1883], 223), Wecklein (1906 ed.), and Parmentier. Paley and Parmentier go on to mistranslate *ὥς μὲν παρ' ἡμῖν* as "in my case." What these words mean is shown by *Med.* 763, *Hcl.* 881, *Ba.* 401, *S. Tr.* 589. Wilamowitz proposed *γὰρ* for *δὲ* in 1015.

²¹ And for that reason Matthiae took *γλῶσσα* to be the tongue of the woman's detractor, which is impossible.

Wecklein²² and later K. Schenkl²³ proposed ὑμῖν for ἡμῖν. "In your opinion, such bitterness is unjustifiable. But first examine the facts." This is only a specious improvement. Clytemnestra has said "When women are maligned, they speak bitterly." She can hardly continue with "You do not think that they should do so." Electra might very well think that maligned women in general (for Clytemnestra is speaking in general terms) have a right to speak bitterly, and to preempt Electra's opinion on the matter does nothing to help Clytemnestra's case.²⁴

Clytemnestra must not weaken her case by admitting that her bitterness is unjustified. She ought to say that, in her view, such bitterness is reasonable, and that, although others may hold a different opinion, they should not reach that opinion until they have learned the facts. The phrase οὐ καλῶς is the opposite of what we want: what we want is οὐ κακῶς. "When a woman gets a bad reputation, there is a certain bitterness in her tongue: in my opinion, not improperly, ὡς μὲν παρ' ἡμῖν, οὐ κακῶς. But people should learn the facts before deciding. If the facts justify hatred, then it is right to hate; otherwise, why hate?" For the sense of κακῶς ("wrongly, improperly") compare *Su.* 297-298 οὗτοι σιωπῶς εἶτα μέμφομαι ποτε| τὴν νῦν σιωπὴν ὡς ἐσιγήθη κακῶς, fr. 199 τὸ δ' ἀσθενές μου καὶ τὸ θῆλυ σώματος| κακῶς ἐμέμφθη.

1041-1046 (Κλ.) εἰ δ' ἐκ δόμων ἦρπαστο Μενέλεως λάθραι,
κτανεῖν μ' Ὀρέστην χρῆν, κασιγνήτης πόσιν
Μενέλαον ὡς σῶσαιμι; cός δὲ πῶς πατὴρ
ἦνέσχετ' ἂν ταῦτ'; εἶτα τὸν μὲν οὐ θανεῖν
1045 κτείνοντα χρῆν τᾶμ', ἐμὲ δὲ πρὸς κείνου παθεῖν;
ἔκτειν', ἐτρέφθη ἥϊπερ ἦν πορεύσιμον . . .

1046 ἥϊπερ Boissonade²⁵, ἥϊπερ L

"If it had been Menelaus (and not Helen) who was abducted, ought I to have killed Orestes in order to save Menelaus, my sister's husband? How would your father have tolerated that? Then ought not he to have died for killing my child and I to have suffered at his hands? I killed him . . ."

The absolute use of παθεῖν, in the sense of τι παθεῖν or θανεῖν, is open

²² *Ars Sophoclis emendandi* (Würzburg, 1869), p. 185.

²³ *ZöG* 25 (1874), 95.

²⁴ Further discussion of this passage may be found in A. Schmidt, *Rh.Mus.* 31 (1876), 565-566, S. Mekler, *Euripidea* (Vienna, 1879), p. 50, E. Holzner, *Studien zu Eur.* (Vienna, 1895), p. 111, G. Ammendola, *RFIC* 48 (1920), 393-394.

²⁵ Attributed to Boissonade by Wecklein (1906 ed.), also conjectured by Page *apud* Denniston.

to the gravest doubt, as Denniston and Jackson²⁶ have shown. Denniston's *θανεῖν* for *παθεῖν* is not appealing. It gives, as he himself says, a "flat repetition," and the change would have to be imputed, as Jackson says, to "a reflective—and therefore improbable—copyist." Jackson's *πόθεν*; (*εἶτα τὸν μὲν οὐ θανεῖν/ κτείνοντα χρῆν τᾶμ', ἐμὲ δὲ πρὸς κείνου; πόθεν*;, "ought he to have escaped death and I to have died? Certainly not") is quite out of court. Jackson has fallen into the trap into which Denniston and others have fallen (and this is fatal in his case, though in Denniston's it was not) of supposing that *οὐ* negatives *θανεῖν* and that the meaning is "ought he not-to-die (i.e., to live) and I to die?" Not *θανεῖν* but *χρῆν* is negatived by *οὐ*. If the infinitive alone is to be negatived, *μή* is needed: *Hcll.* 969 *χρῆν τόνδε μή ζῆν*, and for both types of negation *Ion* 1314–1318 *οὐχ ἵζειν ἐχρῆν/ ἄλλ' ἐξελαύνειν . . . καὶ μὴ 'πὶ ταῦτό τοῦτ' ἰόντ' ἔχειν ἴσον*, "he ought not to sit but (one ought) to drive him away . . . and (he ought) not-to-have."²⁷ The question *οὐ θανεῖν χρῆν*; means "ought not he to have died?" (equivalent to a statement "he ought to have died"). A similar question is *Rh.* 643 *οὐκ ἐγείρεσθαι σε χρῆν*; ("ought you not to be awake?"), and another instance of an infinitive separating *οὐ* from the verb it negatives is *IT* 659 *οὐ λέγειν ἔχοντά με*.

There is a further objection to the transmitted text: an essential part of the antithesis is missing. Euripidean antitheses do not, as a rule, require us to piece out their imperfections with our thoughts; contrasts are fully and precisely expressed. Here is a supplement which provides an object for *παθεῖν*, adds the missing thought in its entirety, and sets a trap for the scribe:

*εἶτα τὸν μὲν οὐ θανεῖν
κτείνοντα χρῆν τᾶμ', ἐμὲ δὲ πρὸς κείνου παθεῖν,
<κτείνουσαν αὐτοῦ παῖδας, οὐκ ἐλάσσονα>;
ἔκτειν' . . .*

"Then ought not he to have died for killing my child and I to have suffered no less at his hands for killing his child?" In other words, *εἰ γὰρ δίκαια τὰδε, καὶ ἐκεῖνα ἔνδικα* (see 1096). I have taken the language from *A. Pe.* 813–814 *κακῶς δρᾶσαντες οὐκ ἐλάσσονα/ πάσχουσι*.

²⁶ *Marg. scaen.* 170–172. Denniston might have made it clearer that the use of *πάσχω*, without object, in the sense "be the sufferer," "be on the receiving end" (often, but not always, in direct antithesis to a verb expressing action), is not uncommon (e.g., *Ba.* 801 *οὔτε πάσχω οὔτε δρᾶν*), and this is the justification for *Rh.* 640. We may also be justified in dispensing with Wilamowitz's <τι> (favored by Jackson) at *Lys.* 20.30; compare 12.100 *ἀκηκόατε ἐοράκατε πεπόνθατε ἔχετε δικάζετε*. This use does not justify the equation *παθεῖν* = *θανεῖν*.

²⁷ I have discussed the difficulties of this passage in *PCPS* n.s. 20 (1974), 30–31.

1150-1154

(Xo.) ἰάχῃσιν δὲ στέγα λάνοι
 τε θριγκοὶ δόμων, τὰδ' ἐνέποντος. ὦ
 χετλία, τί με, γύναι, φονεύσεις φίλαν
 πατρίδα δεκέτεςιν
 σποραΐσιν ἐλθόντ' ἐμάν;

1150-1153 dochmiacs, 1154 syncopated iambics. But in 1152 the initial anceps of the dochmiac χετλία τί με γύναι is resolved. Barrett has shown that of the alleged instances of resolved initial anceps in tragic dochmiacs only this instance and one other have resisted convincing emendation.²⁸ Two emendations are offered: ὦ χέτλια Seidler ("highly doubtful Greek," Denniston) and χέτλιος, ἦ Weil ("possible, for χέτλιος has two terminations at *IT* 651," Denniston). But why not simply χέτλιε? For the corruption see *IT* 858 and *S. Ai.* 358, cited in n. 28 above. Further examples of Euripides' use of three-termination adjectives with two terminations are given by Kühner-Blass i.535-537, Wackernagel, *Vorl. über Syntax* ii.49-50, Dodds on *Ba.* 991-996, Kannicht on *Hel.* 335, and W. Kastner, *Die griechischen Adjektive zweier Endungen auf -ΟΣ* (Heidelberg, 1967). For the separation of noun and adjective in the vocative case (χέτλιε . . . γύναι) see *Hi.* 840-841 πόθεν θανάσιμος τύχα, γύναι, αὖν ἔβα, τάλανα, καρδίαν, *Tr.* 165-166 μέλαι, μόχθων ἐπακουσόμεναι, Τρωιάδες, ἐξορμίζεσθ' (Headlam, ἔξω κομίζεσθ' codd.) οἴκων. Similar is 167 Ἀγαμέμνωνος ὦ κόρα, ἦλυσον, Ἡλέκτρα.

1177-1182

Ὅρ. ἰὼ Γᾶ καὶ Ζεῦ πανδερκέτα
 βροτῶν, ἴδετε τὰδ' ἔργα φόνι-
 α μυσσά, δίγωνα αἰματ' ἐν
 †χθονὶ κείμενα πλαγαῖ†
 1180 a χερὸς ὑπ' ἐμᾶς, ἄποιν' ἐμῶν
 b πημάτων . . .

1179b χθονὶ κείμενα πλαγαῖ is in responsion with the iambic dimeter 1193 λάχε' (Weil, λέχε' L) ἀπὸ γᾶς (l, γᾶς τᾶς L) Ἑλλανίδος (iambus + dochmiac if γᾶς τᾶς is retained). The only conjecture worth mentioning²⁹ is Walberg's χθονὶ <τάδε> πλαγαῖ κείμενα, and this is made unattractive by word-

²⁸ *Hippolytos*, p. 434. See also N. C. Conomis, *Hermes* 92 (1964), 35-38. The three other "possible instances" mentioned by Barrett are certainly to be rejected: *HF* 878 μανίαις <ν> λύσας (μανιάςιν λύσας: see *PCPS* n.s. 20 [1974], 11), *IT* 858 δολίαν ὄτ' ἀγόμεν (δόλιον, but also delete the unwanted ὄτ' with Hartung), *S. Ai.* 358 ἄλιαν (ἄλιον) ὅς ἐπέβας. It remains unclear whether P.Oxy. 2336 justifies the attempts which have been made to restore a further instance at *Hel.* 670. See G. Zuntz, *An inquiry into the transmission of the plays of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1965), p. 230, and Kannicht *ad loc.*

²⁹ Wecklein's list may be supplemented by W. Headlam, *CR* 16 (1902), 251, K. Busche, *Woch. f. kl. Phil.*, 1904, 451, G. Schiassi, *RFIC* 34 (1956), 261.

end after the long anceps in the second metron³⁰ and by neglect of synapheia. I suggest *χθονὶ κεχυμένα πλαγαῖ <διπλαῖ>*, with the verb used as in *Hclld.* 75–76 ἴδετε τὸν γέροντ' ἀμαλὸν (γέροντα μᾶλλον L)³¹ ἐπὶ πέδωι/χόμενον (perfect part. at *HF* 1052, *Ba.* 456), *H. Od.* 22.386–389 οἱ δέ τε πάντες (sc. ἰχθύες . . .) ἐπὶ ψαμάθοις κέχυνται . . . ὥς τότ' ἄρα μνηστῆρες ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι κέχυντο, the phrase *πλαγαῖ διπλαῖ* as at *S. El.* 1415 παῖσον . . . διπλῆν, and the iteration *δίγονα . . . διπλαῖ* much like *Or.* 633 διπλῆς μερίμνης διπτύχους ἰὼν ὁδούς, *A. ScT* 849 διπλαῖ μερίμναν διδύμειν ὄραν κακά (Tucker, *διπλαῖν . . . διδύμ' ἀνορέα fere codd.*), *Pi. N.* 1.44–45 διτταῖσι δοιοῦς . . . μάρψαις . . . χερσὶν ἑαῖς ὄφιας.

Queens' College, Cambridge

³⁰ See L. P. E. Parker, *CQ* n.s. 16 (1966), 14–16, 18 (1968), 247. But 480 provides a parallel (n. 3 above).

³¹ Editors attribute the restoration of ἀμαλὸν to Hemsterhuys (in Hesychius, ed. Alberti, i [1746], s.v. ἀμαλός), but priority belongs to P. Wesseling, *Probabilia* (1731), p. 38. For a recent discussion of this passage see R. Renehan, *Greek textual criticism: a reader* (Harvard, 1969), pp. 113–114.